2 3

1

FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT MAY - 1 2014

CENTRAL DIZZNICT OF CALIFORNIA

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff,

V.

JILL LANSING,

FRANCES SEYFORD, CHAD LUPIA, ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 14-2980-UA (PJWx)

[PROPOSED] ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION

Before the Court is an unlawful detainer action that has been removed from the Los Angeles County Superior Court. For the following reasons, the case is summarily remanded to the state court.

On April 17, 2014, Defendant Chad Lupia, having been sued in the Superior Court of Los Angeles in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action, removed the action to this court. Simply stated, because Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first place (because there is no subject matter jurisdiction), removal of the action is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); see Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563 (2005). The case does not meet the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because it does not raise a federal question. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331.

ase 2:14-cv-02980-UA-DUTY Document 3 Filed 05/01/14 Page 2 of 2 Page ID #:25

does not meet the requirements of diversity jurisdiction because, even 1 assuming that Defendant could establish that there was complete 2 diversity of citizenship between the parties, he could not show that 3 the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, as the Complaint makes 4 5 clear that there is less than \$10,000 in dispute. See 28 U.S.C. 6 §§ 1332. 7 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c), this matter is REMANDED to the Superior Court of 8 9 California, County of Los Angeles, 275 Magnolia Avenue, Long Beach, 10 California 90802; (2) the clerk shall send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) the clerk serve copies of the Order 11 12 on the parties. 13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: april 25 WIY

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

GEORGE H. KING

JNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Presented by:

18

17

14

15

16

19

20

22

21

23

24

25

26

2728

S:\PJW\Cases-IFP\Civil duty IFP denials\Lupia.wpd